

1972. Apparently, we changed this to "go everywhere, America" and now to "stay everywhere, America." While our motives may be good, the fact is that that is not much of a national interest policy.

I would like to also thank our leadership in the committee for including a prohibition in the bill restricting the use of funds for Kosovo. My amendment simply strengthens the prohibition already in the bill against the use of Department of Defense funds towards the conflict in Kosovo by applying the prohibition for all defense funds for Fiscal Year 2000, not merely to funds authorized in this bill.

□ 1345

The amendment also eliminates the invitation in the bill to the President to request additional funds for the conflict in Yugoslavia. We have already given too many taxpayer dollars to this ill-conceived operation which would be better used to strengthen our national defense and to be put into areas where we actually have direct national interests and world peace concerns as well as when we talk about this being \$15 billion, \$20 billion, \$80 billion, whatever it turns out to be, that also means that domestic expenditures are being reduced which is a legitimate taxpayer question as far as where our national interest is.

I want to make clear that I do not intend to limit support for refugees, nor does this amendment prevent missions specifically limited to rescuing United States military personnel or citizens in the same way that the underlying bill was not intended to prevent such activity.

When given the opportunity a few weeks ago, the House of Representatives failed to support U.S. involvement in the bombing campaign in Yugoslavia. While we all hope for eventual peace, the many reasons to oppose involvement remain today. Reasons to oppose any additional funding for Kosovo include:

The potential permanent placement of U.S. ground troops in a region secondary to our national interests where forces will be at risk from violence on both sides. The continued redirection of funds essential to restoring United States military readiness. Let me address one question that we have been debating here, is could funds be diverted from this bill. In fact as I pointed out in the supplemental, there are not restrictions that keep funds from being moved. We often play in the Federal Government these games where, "Oh, we're not directly funding the supplies for the troops, what we do is just replace the supplies that were sent." So that the supply stream that is in the military currently that we were supposedly putting in for military readiness and buildup will be diverted over there and the new funds will merely go to replace what is being diverted. We have seen billions of dollars that were not allocated for Kosovo already

spent, and it is disingenuous to say that, "Oh, there would be another supplemental that would take the additional funds" because they are diverting funds that are already there for troop training, for the gas, for the armaments and so on, and this has disguised the costs of this war and continues to do it. When we say we are building the readiness of our armed forces but do not restrict the funds from being directly or indirectly transferred to Kosovo, it is less than straightforward.

Furthermore, we are continuing to undermine the U.S. troop morale because they are being asked to do more with less and are being deployed at a rate like never before. That not only includes our active military but it also includes our Reserve and Guard where we are seeing a drop in reenlistments.

The fact that the NATO air war accelerated and augmented the tragic refugee crisis which we are and will continue to support financially through other areas. That is not arguing that he was not an evil man and is not an evil man. I am speaking of President Milosevic. Or that other leaders in countries in the Balkans did not practice genocide. The fact is it is not clear what was going to happen and to what extent it was going to happen.

Furthermore, the additional confusion which is added to our foreign policy priorities when we fail to establish a clear standard for humanitarian intervention while clearly undermining our relationships with international powers that clearly impact high priority U.S. national security interests including China and Russia. Let me explain that. It is terrible. I was in the camps in Macedonia, too. I spent a whole afternoon talking to refugees. You cannot deny, any citizen cannot deny who has talked to these people that throats were slit, that there are mass graves, that there were rapes. The question is, that is also occurring in many other parts of the world. What is our standard for intervention? That is the question here. And when? Is it just because they are white? That is a kind of question we have to confront with ourselves, just because CNN is in a certain part of the world. Why are we not in Sudan? What are the compelling reasons why we would intervene in one country and not another? Furthermore, to divert these resources like the last carrier over to the Persian Gulf so another carrier could be diverted into the Mediterranean leaving us blind in Asia where clearly we have potential coming conflicts between India, China and China's client states like Pakistan and North Korea and Japan, where clearly there are world peace major issues at stake and we are bogged down now in Iraq, in Bosnia, now in Haiti and now potentially even greater in Kosovo.

The continuous undermining of the stability of neighboring democracies like Macedonia and impeding the democratic position of Montenegro.

The U.S. policy of supporting, at least tacitly, the Kosovo Liberation

Army which has some established ties to narcotics trafficking and terrorism targeted at Americans. One of the fundamental questions here in the ironies of this agreement is that we did not support the Kosovo Liberation Army and yet at the same time we are now going to accomplish for Milosevic one of the goals that he had in disarming them, at least temporarily.

The undermining of NATO when we define its continuing existence as dependent upon as the defeat of a sovereign country with a history of internal conflict which offers no direct threat to a NATO member. We constantly heard about article 5 which was supposedly the stability of Europe. Now, how in the world have we advanced the stability of Europe? We have Macedonia and Montenegro teetering, we have Greece with domestic conflict. We had Romania and Hungary concerned on the northern border. We have Russia, a historic ally of Serbia and a rising nationalist movement in Russia that we have given credibility to and potentially with the switch in the government of Russia having their armed troops on the ground in a very dicey type of situation in an area where we thought we had expelled them. We have a general and potentially and most likely an independent Kosovo in the middle of Europe. An armed Muslim state in the center of Europe will not add to the stability. I point that out because I did not meet a single Kosovar who was ever willing to serve under a Serbian government.

Furthermore, what does this mean in the concept of independent states, if the Kosovars have no intention of ever serving under a Serbian government? Does this now mean that in Palestine we are giving a blank check to the Palestinians to have an independent state separate from Israel? What about the Kurds in Turkey? There is a very difficult international policy question underneath this supposed peace settlement that I say puts our world positions at greater risk than we had when we first went in.

Furthermore, it is no wonder that China and Russia in the earlier question of when we are going to intervene in a humanitarian intervention, part of the concern here around the world, this is not a Christian moral position. I could argue from a Christian moral position that we should intervene anywhere. And when Russians started bombing Chechnya we should have gone in. But what are our criterias? If they are a big partner, we do not go in? If they are a little trade partner, we do go? It is not clear. Because the terror and the murder is happening in many places throughout the world and was not extraordinarily greater in this area until we started the process. It was terrible but it was not extraordinarily greater than anywhere else in about 30 to 40 countries.

Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is if we should not be involved, then we should not be involved in either the